DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 964 CE 034 755

TITLE	Hearings on Reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Part 20: Older Americans Vocational Education Act, H.R. 6985. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Seventh Congress, Second Session on H.R. 66.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	23 Sep 82
NOTE	54p.; Not available in paper copy because of small type. For related documents, see CE 034 752-754 and ED 223 890.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Vocational Education; Age Discrimination; Ancillary School Services; Counseling Services; *Educational Facilities; Educational Legislation; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; Job Training; *Older Adults; Retirement; Retraining; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 97th; *Reauthorization Legislation; *Vocational Education Act 1963

ABSTRACT

The discussion in this hearing, centering on extension of the appropriations under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, focuses on H.R. 6985, the Older Americans Vocational Education Act, which authorizes $20 million per year for grants to educational agencies and institutions to establish model centers for vocational education for older persons. Testimony includes statements and prepared statements, letters, and supplemental materials from eight individuals representing the American Association of Retired Persons; the Institute of Lifetime Learning; Wave III Associates; two Representatives in Congress; and the Connecticut Advisory Council on Vocational and Career Education. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224964

HEARINGS ON REAUTHORIZATION OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Part 20: Older Americans Vocational Education Act, H.R. 6985

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 66

TO EXTEND THE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS UNDER THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ACT OF 1963

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON SEPTEMBER 23, 1982

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

99-856 O WASHINGTON : 1982

CE 034 735

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
TED WEISS, New York
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California

JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
KEN KRAMER, Colorado
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MILLICENT FENWICK, New Jersey
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
EUGENE JOHNSTON, North Carolina
LAWRENCE J. DeNARDIS, Connecticut
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
WENDELL BAILEY, Missouri
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
GEORGE MILLER, California
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
(Ex Officio)
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
LAWRENCE J. DeNARDIS, Connecticut
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, D.C., on September 23, 1982	1
Text of H.R. 6985	3
Statement of—	
Hacking, James M., assistant counsel for Federal legislation, American Association of Retired Persons, accompanied by David A. Affeldt, legislative consultant and Mary Annette Klippensteen, education specialist, Institute of Lifetime Learning	20
Knudson, Eric W., president, Wave III Associates	34
Pepper, Hon. Claude, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida	14
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—	
Hughes, Peter W., legislative counsel, American Association of Retired Persons, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated September 30, 1982	40
Klippensteen, Annette, education specialist, Institute of Lifetime Learning, Washington, D.C., letter to Chairman Perkins, with enclosure, dated October 25, 1982	47
Knudson, Eric W. and John A. Jacobsen, Wave III Associates, Wilton, Conn., prepared statement of	25
Ratchford, Hon. William R., a Representative in Congress from the State of Connecticut, prepared statement of	11
Sillari, Edward A., Danbury, Conn., prepared statement of	42

HEARINGS ON REAUTHORIZATION OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Part 20: Older Americans Vocational Education Act, H.R. 6985

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1982

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:10 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl A. Perkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Andrews, Ratchford, and Goodling.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, counsel; and Nancy Kober, legislative specialist.

Chairman PERKINS. The subcommittee will come to order.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is conducting a hearing this morning on H.R. 6985, the Older Americans Vocational Education Act.

This bill was introduced by our colleague on the subcommittee, Congressman Ratchford. The legislation authorizes $20 million per year for grants to educational agencies and institutions to establish model centers for vocational education for older persons.

These centers would provide training and retraining for older workers, provide counseling and support services to older persons, and encourage other providers of vocational education to offer more programs geared at older Americans.

In addition, the bill amends the Vocational Education Act to encourage the elimination of age discrimination in vocational education programs, to require State personnel to coordinate vocational education programs and activities for older persons, and to emphasize State planning of programs for older Americans.

I would like to take this opportunity to tell the people of Connecticut of my deep appreciation for the energetic and tireless efforts of Congressman William Ratchford in furthering the work of the Committee on Education and Labor.

In the 4 years he has served on the committee we have dealt with a great number of important, controversial, and difficult matters. He has always been here to make a contribution when he was needed, and I am grateful.

Congressman Ratchford has been one of the stalwarts on this committee ever since he came here and has always been present on every controversial issue that we have dealt with over a period of years.

Congressman Ratchford serves on two subcommittees of this committee, and also serves on subcommittees of the Committee on House Administration and the Select Committee on Aging.

In this Congress, in particular, his contribution has been notable as the Congress has sought to reduce spending while resisting unreasonable attempts to weaken and destroy programs of child nutrition, education, student assistance, and the other programs within this committee's jurisdiction.

I want to tell the people of Connecticut that all of us on this committee look forward to serving with Bill Ratchford in the 98th Congress.

I am delighted that he has introduced this legislation.

[Text of H.R. 6985 follows:]

I

97TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 6985

To amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to make grants available for vocational programs for older persons and to establish a grant program for the establishment of model centers for vocational education for older persons.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 2, 1982

Mr. RATCHFORD (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. WEISS) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

A BILL

To amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to make grants available for vocational programs for older persons and to establish a grant program for the establishment of model centers for vocational education for older persons.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Older Americans Vocational Education Act".

MODEL CENTERS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR OLDER PERSONS

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Education shall establish a model grant program to establish and operate model centers

to focus greater attention on the special vocational education needs of older persons and to promote employment opportunities for older persons in accordance with this section.

(b) Any eligible recipient which desires to receive a grant from the Secretary under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary in such form and at such times as the Secretary may require. Such application shall—

(1) describe the manner in which the center will be established and operated;

(2) contain an estimate of the cost for the establishment and operation of the center; and

(3) include such other information as the Secretary of Education determines to be necessary to assist him in carrying out his functions under this section.

(c) Any center established and operated by an eligible recipient under this section shall—

(1) provide training or retraining to update older persons skills, prepare such individuals for new careers when their skills have been rendered obsolete by technological advances, and promote employment through training or retraining in areas of job potential in growth industries utilizing new technologies;

(2) provide assistance for later-life career changes, with special emphasis on the needs of older persons who are displaced homemakers;

(3) provide information, counseling, and support services to assist older persons in obtaining employment;

(4) encourage providers of vocational education, including community colleges and technical schools, to offer more job training opportunities targeted to or easily accessible to older persons; and

(5) promote training of paraprofessionals in gerontology and geriatrics.

(d) Any center established and operated by an eligible recipient under this section shall provide services under subsection (c) to older persons, and shall give priority consideration to those older persons who—

(1) need skills for entering or reentering the job market;

(2) are unemployed and need to be retrained for a new career;

(3) have not recently been in the work force and need to upgrade present skills;

(4) are entering the work force for the first time; or

(5) need training for new high-technology jobs.

(e) Any grant made by the Secretary under this section shall not exceed $400,000 for any fiscal year.

(f) The Secretary shall establish and operate a national clearinghouse within the Department of Education to provide State and local governments, and interested organizations and individuals with information concerning centers established under this section and their programs.

(g) For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "eligible recipient" means a State, State or local educational agency, educational institution, post secondary educational institution, and private vocational training institution as such terms are defined in section 195 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C 2461) and also includes any business or labor organization, public agency, and nonprofit or profitmaking organization.

(2) the term "older person" means an individual fifty-five years of age or over;

(3) the term "Secretary " means the Secretary of Education; and

(4) the term "vocational education" has the meaning given such term in section 195(1) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

(h) There is authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1984, 1985, and 1986 to carry out this section. Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

AMENDMENTS TO THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

SEC. 3. (a) Section 101 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 2301) is amended—

(1) in clause (3) after "sex stereotyping" by inserting "and age discrimination and age stereotyping" and by inserting immediately before the comma "and all ages"; and

(2) in clause (4), after "youths" by inserting "and older persons".

(b) Section 104(b)(1) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 2304(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D) after "women" by inserting "and older persons";

(2) in subparagraph (E) after "sex" by inserting "and age";

(3) in subparagraph (F) after "sex" by inserting "and age";

(4) in subparagraph (G) after "of sex" by inserting "and age", and after "and sex" by inserting "and age"; and

(5) in subparagraph (H) before the semicolon by inserting "and older persons".

(c) Section 105(a) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 2305(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (18), (19), and (20) (and any references thereto) as paragraphs (19), (20), and (21), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (17) the following new paragraph:

"(18) are older persons with backgrounds and experience in employment and training programs, and who are knowledgeable with respect to the special experiences and problems of age discrimination in job training and employment and of age stereotyping in vocational education, including older persons who are members of minority groups and who have, in addition to such backgrounds and experience, special knowledge of the problems of discrimination in job training and employment against older persons who are members of such groups;".

(d) Section 107(b) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 2307(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(B)(i) after "disadvantaged persons" by inserting ", older persons,"; and

(2) in paragraph (4) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and by inserting immediately after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

"(B) set forth policies and procedures which the State will follow so as to assure equal access to vocational education programs by older persons including—

"(i) a detailed description of such policies and procedures,

"(ii) actions to be taken to overcome age discrimination and age stereotyping in all State and local vocational education programs, and

"(iii) incentives, to be provided to eligible recipients so that such recipients will—

"(I) encourage the enrollment of older persons in nontraditional courses of study, and

"(II) develop model programs to reduce age stereotyping in all occupations; and".

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect October 1, 1983.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Ratchford, do you have any opening remarks you would like to make?

Mr. RATCHFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask permission to place my opening statement in the record, and to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling these hearings.

You have shown great sensitivity to older Americans. In fact, working together 2 years ago we opened up the Higher Education Act to give encouragement to the nontraditional student. There are literally millions of students in America today who otherwise would not have access to higher education.

Today what we are here to discuss is opening up the vocational education field for the older worker who does not want to be put out to pasture, who does not want to be forced to retire, who needs new skills to remain in the job market, and who has the job dedication and the persistence to remain productive if only we would provide the opportunity.

What we talk about in this proposed legislation is providing that opportunity by establishing model centers for the training of older workers in vocational skills. Vocational education is essential, not only to the younger student looking for a trade, but for the older worker looking for a new opportunity.

I can think of no one better to come and speak on that subject than the champion of the older American, the Honorable Claude Pepper. He is a man with great strength and resilience, and a man I have grown to love like a father and a family member. He is a man we honored last night. Hundreds of people from across these United States who came to say:

"Claude Pepper, we appreciate what you have done. You are 82 years young, and we want you working for not only all Americans, but especially older Americans, for many more years." Happy birthday. We are pleased to have you here this morning.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you, Mr. Ratchford.

Without objection, your prepared opening remarks will be placed in the record at this point.

[Prepared statement of Congressman Ratchford follows:]

Prepared Statement of Hon. William R. Ratchford, a Representative in Congress From the State of Connecticut

I would like to commend Chairman Perkins for holding this hearing today, to discuss an issue of great importance to the millions of Americans over the age of 55, who would like to work, yet are unable to do so. I applaud the efforts of this Subcommittee in addressing this vital issue.

It is estimated that by the year 2000, the number of persons age 55 or over will increase by 19 percent. As policy-makers, we must begin to consider the implications of a population that will not only live longer, but an increasing proportion of which will want to work longer. Sadly, this trend will be accompanied by a sharp increase in the poverty rate - the worst being among older women and minorities. The pressures of inflation and the disproportionate cuts in Federal programs for the elderly have influenced the attitude of many older persons toward work. Recent surveys show that 74 percent of 55- to 64-year-old persons wanted to continue in some type of part-time work beyond retirement. A 1981 Lou Harris poll showed the figure to be as high as 79 percent.

However, many individuals over the age of 50 who have lost their jobs or who have never worked, are experiencing great difficulty in entering or reentering the work force. We know that many are forced into social security at age 62 because they cannot find employment. Critical barriers to employment or reemployment of the older worker include obsolete job skills, lack of skills, individual attitudes, lack of job search skills, and employer discrimination in hiring older persons, particularly when training is involved.

Obsolete skills and the lack of skills are hardly the result of declining learning abilities. These problems are especially prevalent among the male population of older workers, displaced by plant closings or the influx of new technology. The lack of skills is most characteristic of older women entering the labor force for the first time after years of work in the home raising a family.

As a result of this dilemma, there has been a sharp increase in the number of older individuals taking educational courses to acquire job skills. According to a 1981 Lou Harris/NCOA survey, the number of people over the age of 40 seeking specific job skills has more than doubled in the past 7 years. Presently, and with few exceptions, programs funded through the Vocational Education Act have focused primarily on younger persons. Those focused on older persons are, for the most part, geared to preretirement counseling. Further, despite Federal mandates, funding required to broaden the scope and number of educational programs for the adult learner has been absent.

Federal job training programs that serve the older person are quite limited and primarily serve the low-income, chronically unemployed or hard to employ. Displaced homemaker programs do not assist persons over the age of 60, and the States by and large have failed to provide these services on their own. The legislation I have introduced would provide a greater focus on the older worker in vocational education programs, and provide for the establishment of a 3-year $20 million demonstration program to encourage the development of training and retraining for the older worker.

Under this legislation, entitled "The Older Workers Vocational Education Act," model centers would be established to focus greater attention on the special vocational needs of the older worker, and to promote employment opportunities for them. Serving those age 55 and older, these model centers would provide training and retraining in the following areas: to update skills and prepare the older worker for new careers when technological advances have rendered their current skills obsolete; promote employment in areas of job potential in growth industries. The centers would also provide assistance for later-life career changes, with special emphasis on the older displaced homemaker; information counseling and support services to assist older persons in obtaining employment; encourage vocational education providers, including community colleges and technical schools, to offer more job training opportunities targeted and easily accessible to the older person. Finally the centers would also promote the training of paraprofessionals in gerontology and geriatrics, to help meet the increasing demand for such services.

Under my legislation, the Secretary of the Department of Education would be given broad authority for the design and conduct of the demonstration program. By placing a $400,000 cap on the level of any one grant. I expect that some 50 to 70 grants could be funded each year throughout the Nation. Eligible recipients of grants under this program would include States, State or local education agencies, post-secondary and vocational training institutions, any business or labor organization, and a public agency, non-profit or for-profit organization. State sponsored model centers could readily trap other available resources at the State level and could be easily coordinated with other employment and training programs. In addition, the private sector has demonstrated its willingness and competence in conducting training and retraining programs.

It is my hope that the adoption of this legislation will provide a greater focus on the special needs of the older worker in vocational education. It is aimed at fostering the development of skills development and employment counseling programs that will assist the many older Americans who want to continue to work or reenter the work force. As with the promotion policies and procedures of many firms which discriminate against the older worker, so too is the case with training opportunities. For many firms, there are powerful economic and organizational forces that lead to the selection of younger workers for the most intensive and expensive forms of training - this despite the discovery by some firms that older workers are more committed to company objectives than younger workers, that they hold vast experience and are willing to learn new skills, and that they are reliable. One recent study reveals that many executives report that it was by sheer accident that they discovered the value of their retired workers when, in desperation, they called upon them for assistance in handling backlogs of work. The executives reported that it proved to be more economical to have their own experienced former employees handle the extra work on a part-time or temporary basis than to call in outsiders with no experience whatsoever.

The Grumman Corp. in New York has successfully used about 600 older workers over the past 10 years in positions ranging from skilled technicians and engineers to publications writers. Grumman executives found the older workers to be experienced, talented, and willing to get back to work. The Bankers Life & Casualty in Chicago is also serious about the use of older workers. Bankers recruit older

workers from outside the company, and has established a temporary pool to provide full- and part-time jobs for its own retirees. At IBM, retirees hold a number of positions throughout the company and many work up to 120 hours per year. They are hired to run preretirement sessions and health education programs for other retirees, active employees, and the spouses of both; to be call dispatchers and switchboard operators, among other things. In the Greater Hartford, Conn., area, the Travelers Insurance Co. has formed a consortium with other insurance companies to provide training in computer processing for retirees. Monsanto has established a successful program which relocates middle-level executives to St. Louis for a year-long retraining program conducted at Washington University. General Electric retrains middle-aged engineers at its Utica plant, and has found this practice to be more cost-effective than hiring younger college graduates. In responding to the adverse impact of foreign competition on its business, the International Silver Co. converted one of its plants and retrained many of its older employees as toolmakers.

The second careers program in Los Angeles helps mandatorily retired corporate executives find a way to remain active in either volunteer capacities or through full- and part-time work. They service many of the largest corporations in southern California by helping them fill their needs not only for permanent help, but also for vocation relief personnel, for experienced people needed temporarily on short-term projects, or for help in meeting a deadline. This program has met with tremendous success, and the staff has found the older worker to embody a unique combination of experience, skill, and maturity, making training and placement easy. The College Emeritii in San Diego, Calif., has operated a job development and job search and training program for those over 55 years of age for the past 5 years. Courses offered include training for apartment house management, court conservator, volunteer leadership, computer work, and office skills. Yet another example of a successful program in this area is the Grassmont Adult Career Center health education reentry program based in LaMesa, Calif. This program offers training to adults for a variety of health related jobs such as medical clerk, nurse assistant, medical office management, medical transcription specialist, dental health assistant, psychiatric technician, and vocational nursing. It also offers reentry courses for nurses and licenses vocational nurses. About 900 students go through this program each year with as many as 60 percent over the age of 55. Many at the age of 70 or older have been enrolled, and job placement has been high.

These examples of both private and public sector sponsored employment and training programs demonstrate the possibilities for dramatically increasing the number of older workers that can remain in or reenter the work force. While these examples are quite impressive, the availability of such services has been severely limited to date. Relatively few private sector concerns have undertaken such bold initiatives, and the Federal and State governments have been remiss in their responsibilities toward the older worker. One recent study revealed that while many States provide consumer and life-coping programs to meet the psycological and social needs of the older person, few offer opportunities for the older person to gain the vocational skills necessary to reenter the labor force when they may lack the skills to do so, or who are unemployed due to a lack of competencies.

Additional evidence exists at the Federal level. Another recent study found that 270 programs concerned with adult education and training existed in 29 Cabinet-level departments and agencies, with Federal support estimated to be in excees of $14 billion. However, only a small fraction of this money supported learning opportunities for adults beyond the traditional college age. It has also been found that academic institutions, because of a shortage of funds, have been unable to support such programs in the absence of any Federal mandates for life-long learning.

Under my legislation, Mr. Chairman, the Vocational Education Act would be amended to provide a greater focus on the special training and employment needs of the older person, and to provide for this important new demonstration program, I hope these actions would pave the way for broad-scale efforts in the future to address a growing desire by an expanding aging population to remain active in the work force. It is also important to note that increased labor force participation by the older worker will not only help their economic status, but improve the general economy as well. In a noted Data Resources, Inc., study, it was found that increased older worker participation would yield an additional $10 billion in revenues to the ailing social security trust funds by the year 2005, and would have a very positive effect on the overall economy.

The reasons for prompt and complete consideration of this issue are compelling, and I look forward to the testimony we will hear this morning from our panel of outstanding witnesses.

Chairman PERKINS. I likewise am delighted that we have the champion of the elderly of the Nation, Representative Claude Pepper.

He was a U.S. Senator when I came to the Congress. He is a great Member of the Congress, and a champion for the elderly.

There has never been a man, to my knowledge, in my 34 years experience, that has worked for the elderly like Claude Pepper.

We are delighted you are with us today.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Ratchford.

Mr. Chairman, I will say at the end of this year I will have been a Member of the Congress in both Houses for 34 years.

I was on the Education and Labor Committee in the Senate for all the years I was there. Justice Black was the first chairman under whom I served.

But in my little more than a third of a century, I have never known a Member of Congress more dedicated to the cause of education who worked harder to make possible education for the people of this country, particularly the young and now the elderly, than your distinguished self, the chairman of this distinguished committee.

So far as Mr. Ratchford is concerned, we could not do without him on the Aging Committee. His great experience as Commission on Aging in his State of Connecticut has given him a special knowledge of the subject.

His heart is attuned with the needs of the elderly people of this country and he, of course, is the outstanding author of the legislation about which I am to say a few words this morning.

So, I thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to testify before your distinguished committee in support of legislation to provide Federal funding for the training of older workers.

The Older Americans Vocational Education Act, conceived and introduced by our colleague, Bill Ratchford, is one of the most important pieces of legislation before Congress today.

A vast wealth of talent and productive capacity is going to waste as literally millions of older Americans remain outside this Nation's work force.

Vocational training, as would be provided under this bill, would enable many of these older persons to gain employment, therefore contributing to their own and to the Nation's economic well being.

A great deal has been said in recent years about the aging of the population, the so-called graying of America. Unfortunately too much emphasis has been placed on the costs of providing medical and social services to this aging population and not enough attention has been given to the desire and vast abilities among older Americans to be contributing members of society.

National surveys consistently report that millions of retirees would prefer to be working. A large number, however, lack the basic skills to compete in a world of rapidly changing technology.

There is a ray of hope for these workers in the changing demographic picture. Employers are gradually turning to older and retired workers to fill gaps in their work forces or to supply experienced talent not available in younger members of the population.

In testimony before our Aging Committee recently we learned that shortages of skilled talent loom on the horizon. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics the demand for engineers will exceed the available supply by an average of 15,000 per year beginning in 1990 and continuing through the end of the century.

Aerospace companies already are turning to retired engineers to fill jobs for which younger engineers are unavailable. Similar labor shortages are being reported in the fast food industry and the computer programing industry.

With an unemployment rate approaching 10 percent, some would question whether older workers will ever be in great demand.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the work force will grow much slower in the decades ahead than it did over the past two decades.

The lower birthrate of the 1960's and 1970's will cause the 18- to-24-year-old population to shrink by more than 3 million during the next decade.

If we can get the economy even modestly back on its feet, we should begin to see a decided increase in the demand for older workers.

May I say, Mr. Chairman—and Mr. Ratchford will remember the testimony we had before the Aging Committee—there is a company making what they call software for computers here on the edge of our city in Virginia, which employs nothing but older workers.

They are growing very rapidly. These older workers are trained in the new skills that they need to do the computer programing work there.

The company is finding these older workers completely satisfactory and is steadily expanding its growth.

As the demand for labor increases it would be a shame if older workers were not allowed to work because of mandatory retirement policies or because of inadequate training.

I have introduced legislation to bring an end to mandatory retirement and other forms of age discrimination. We are hopeful that we can enact this legislation by the end of the 97th Congress or early in the 98th Congress.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, we have a commitment from the President that he will support us in the removal of the 70 cap.

As you know, the law now provides—which we enacted in 1978—that you cannot mandatorily retire a worker under age 70.

The President is agreeable to lifting that cap and removing it entirely and providing protection against mandatory retirement on account of age to all workers now employed to any age.

He is not willing yet to go with us, as we would like to do, to protect the people applying for a job over 70 and people seeking promotions over 70.

But if we can get the first step, then we can move on to the other steps at a later time.

If we could also implement a training program for older workers we will have made significant progress toward solving the employment problems of older Americans.

Many older Americans need only updating of skills. By the way, Mr. Chairman, there are a great many workers who are in trades or in vocations which may not be very exciting or very gratifying. They welcome an opportunity to retire at a given age and get out of it. They have done their job for 25 or 30 years. But if they could be trained to move into another and more interesting activity, they would love to keep on working.

Then, of course, they should always have some flexibility in the work schedule that they could enjoy. Maybe they would not keep their nose right on the grindstone, as we say. But there would be a certain number of hours every day.

But the training of older Americans is essential if they are going to be self-supporting and going to help support social security and going to contribute to their country.

Many older Americans need only updating of skills; others require a complete retooling for a change in career. Whatever the need, research over the past two decades clearly demonstrates that older individuals can be trained.

In fact, some studies show that once enrolled, older workers are more likely to complete a course of training than are younger workers.

Once trained, older workers tend to remain with their employers longer than younger workers.

The Older Americans Vocational Education Act would begin to fill a great void in this country by providing model training centers for older workers.

To date, very few public resources have been spent on training and employing older workers. The reason for this is the persistent myth that investing in older workers is a poor use of scarce resources.

On the contrary, in a major study by Data Resources, Inc., released at a hearing of the Aging Committee, it was reported that increasing the number of older persons in the work force to their level in 1970 would, by the year 2005, generate $40 billion in new public revenues and would also add $10 billion annually to the social security fund.

Investing $20 million toward this end, as would be authorized by this bill, would therefore, be a sound investment.

In the future we can expect to see an increasingly well-educated, healthy, and employable older population who need to work.

National statistics show that older persons who work are much better off financially. Those who are not working are four times as likely to fall below the poverty line.

Work is important not only as a much-needed source of income. It is also a source of self-esteem and self-worth.

I can tell you from experience that I have learned in my own family that continued work is also good for the health of the individual.

Employers need older workers, too. And, despite persistent strains of age discrimination still evident in the workplace, more and more employers are recognizing the virtues of older workers.

In fact, we are told that by 1990 the shortage of people with expertise in industry will be such that they will have to keep more of their older people on the job in order to get an adequate number of competent people.

Older workers are more dependable, less accident prone, and as productive as younger workers. Loyalty to an employer runs high among the older work force. And, few employers deny that you get a day's work for a day's pay from an older worker.

If, as a nation, we continue to ignore and squander our older working population, we will cease to be great. The social security system will be strained unnecessarily.

Labor shortages will plague the work force. And productivity will continue to decline.

A greater emphasis on recycling, retraining, and reemploying our older workers will produce an enormous financial and social dividend that will contribute to economic growth.

Enacting the Older Americans Vocational Education Act is a step in the right direction.

I want to commend it to you and your committee.

Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you for an outstanding statement.

Mr. Ratchford?

Mr. RATCHFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, obviously you feel that the older worker is a reliable worker who wants to work in most instances and could benefit from vocational training and retraining; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. RATCHFORD. Have you witnessed this in Florida and as you traveled across these United States that people do not want to be told when they have to retire or not retire, but want to be given the option to work and the tools to do so?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Ratchford, as I travel around the country, I hardly ever go through an airport that I do not have one or more people walk up to me and say: "We want to thank you for what all you have done to help me keep on working."

The other day several engineers came into my office. They all seemed to have responsible jobs. They said: "We want you to know how much we appreciate the fact that we are going to be permitted to keep on working for a certain number of years."

It is absolutely irrational and unreasonable that a man should be denied the right to keep on working at a job that he is doing well just because the Lord has blessed him with another birthday above a certain limit any more than if you were to say that we are going to fire every blue-eyed man and woman on this work force.

That is irrelevant to the subject of doing a job.

The elderly people want the privilege of working. Maybe they would like a little relaxation in hours and pressures. But that easily can be worked out.

Industry needs to use these older workers in areas where they have expertise.

For example, you may remember, Mr. Ratchford, and I am sure you will, when the Mutual of Omaha Co. had their chairman of the board appear before our Aging Committee on behalf of protecting workers against mandatory retirement.

He said:

"When I became chairman of the board of Mutual of Omaha, we only had one chairman and one executive officer. Now we have 10."

He said:

"We have found places for these experienced executives and instead of kicking them out when they get to a certain age, we will put them in other areas of service to the company where their great knowledge and experience will be extremely valuable."

There are innumerable places where the elderly can keep on working greatly to the advantage of the economy.

Mr. RATCHFORD. I know we agree on this because I worked side by side with you in the Aging Committee. But what we had to do by law is to provide the opportunity—in this case through the Vocational Education Act—to give them the training to go along with the desire and the talent and the resolve to continue working.

Is that not correct?

Mr. PEPPER. The chairman is qualified in the area of education. We would not have to set up separate institutions all over the country. There are plenty of existing institutions where the training they need could be provided, or under the directions of these institutions or systems that we now have.

So, we need the money and the authority to give these people the right and the ability to keep on working valuably for their employer or for some employer.

Mr. RATCHFORD. I want to thank you very much, Mr. Pepper.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Andrews?

Mr. ANDREWS. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Andrews is another outstanding member of the Aging Committee, Mr. Chairman. We are very proud of what he and Mr. Ratchford have contributed.

Chairman PERKINS. I am delighted that Mr. Goodling is here. He and I work closely together. He is an outstanding member from Pennsylvania.

He has been very much interested, Mr. Pepper, in the Older Americans Vocational Education Act. He has talked about it for a long time. In fact, he is a cosponsor of this bill.

I think he may want to ask you a question or two. Mr. Pepper has been testifying in favor of your legislation and has done an excellent job.

Mr. Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I merely want to say that I have vocational education people trying to see me out here in the lobby area. That is why I did not get here in time for your testimony.

I am very happy to be a cosponsor because I feel very strongly that there is no age where somebody ceases to be productive. That is a matter of the mind.

And, at every opportunity, that should be given to all people to be productive citizens as long as they so desire.

I might say that I am glad you told Mr. Pepper about my involvement in this because someone told me he is coming into my district. [Laughter.]

I have a statement that I wanted to offer. I would merely say that Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to cosponsor the Older Americans Vocational Education Act along with my colleague from Connecticut, Mr. Ratchford.

I feel that it is important to raise the issue of skill training and age discrimination in the context of the Education and Labor Committee's hearings on the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act.

The bill proposes to establish a 3-year demonstration program to encourage the development of training and retraining efforts for workers age 55 or older.

In addition, the bill would amend the current Vocational Education Act to provide for the inclusion of the older worker in State plans. This legislation embodies a crucial concept which has been overlooked in the past.

While I support this concept and endorse this legislation because it raises the issue of vocational training for older workers, I also have several concerns which I hope to address when the committee begins to mark up the vocational education amendments.

Without a comprehensive look at the Vocational Education Act, I am concerned that my merely broadening the pool of eligible recipients, the vocational services might be seriously diluted.

In the present fiscal environment, it will be necessary to carefully craft the authorization to insure inclusion of the older worker without harming programs designed for youth and young adults.

In addition, I am concerned with the proposal to set up demonstration programs without an appropriate role for State boards of vocational education.

If training centers for the elderly are ever to take root, State level involvement will be essential. This is another area which must be carefully examined in committee.

While I think these concerns are legitimate and ones that must be addressed in committee, I am positive that this bill will play a vital role in placing the issue of vocational training for the older worker before the committee and ultimately before Congress.

This is a concept that must be dealt with as the committee proceeds with its consideration of the Vocational Education Act.

I would ask Mr. Pepper, inasmuch as you represent an area where this program would be particularly important, what do you hear from your constituency in relationship to their participation in vocational education or the lack of availability and any kind of discrimination in relationship to their participation in the work force.

Mr. PEPPER. There would be a warm response, I think, on the part of the elderly people to that opportunity.

If the word were put out in the proper way that that kind of training was available, then a large number of workers would flock to take advantage of it, in my opinion.

It would be a great success as a training program.

Mr. GOODLING. I thought maybe you more than any of us in the Congress would have more contact with the senior citizens.

Chairman PERKINS. Senator Pepper, we want to thank you very much.

Our next witness is Jim Hacking, assistant counsel for Federal legislation, American Assocation of Retired Persons.

Mr. Hacking, we welcome you here to this committee today.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JAMES M. HACKING, ASSISTANT COUNSEL FOR FEDERAL LEGISLATION, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS, ACCOMPANIED BY DAVID A. AFFELDT, LEGISLATIVE CONSULTANT; AND MARY ANNETTE KLIPPENSTEEN, EDUCATION SPECIALIST, INSTITUTE OF LIFETIME LEARNING

Mr. HACKING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On my left is David Affeldt, legislative consultant, and on my right is Mary Annette Klippensteen who is AARP's Institute of Lifetime Learning's education specialist.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, the American Association of Retired Persons appreciates the opportunity to testify on H.R. 6985, the Older Americans Vocational Education Act.

At the outset, AARP wishes to commend the subcommittee for holding a prompt hearing on this legislation. We would also like to commend Congressman Ratchford for taking the lead in developing this bill.

The Association strongly supports enactment of H.R. 6985. Our staff worked closely with Congressman Ratchford in developing this measure.

We believe that H.R. 6985 represents a sound approach to providing training opportunities for older Americans. It would also make the Vocational Education Act better balanced in serving persons whose skills have been rendered obsolete by technological advances.

Moreover, the bill is realistic in terms of budgetary and political realities.

The centerpiece of H.R. 6985 is a 3-year demonstration program to develop models to promote employment opportunities for persons 55 or older and to focus greater attention on the special vocational needs of older persons.

The bill would authorize $20 million for demonstration projects to:

One, provide training or retraining to update skills, prepare older workers for new careers, and promote employment in growth industries;

Two, offer assistance for later life career changes, particularly for older displaced homemakers;

Three, provide a wide range of support services to help older Americans in obtaining employment;

Four, encourage community colleges, technical schools, and other vocational education providers to offer increased training opportunities targeted to persons 55 or older; and

Five, promote training of paraprofessionals in gerontology and geriatrics, such as nutritional aides or health aides.

In addition, H.R. 6985 would make technical amendments to the Vocational Education Act to clarify that older workers are among the target populations to be served.

I turn now to reasons to include older persons in vocational education legislation.

First, older Americans want and need to work.

Education and employment opportunities are clearly high priorities for aged and aging Americans. This point was made emphatically in a 1980 association survey which found that 74 percent of 55- to 64-year-olds wanted to continue in some type of paid part-time work beyond retirement.

The association has a longstanding policy supporting increased flexibility in work arrangements. We have attempted to be a model employer in offering our employees a whole menu of work options, including part-time employment, full-time work, flexitime, phased retirement, and other work arrangements.

Quite clearly, the "graying" of the work force is already forcing reassessment of existing work-life patterns. Unfortunately today, work is oftentimes an "all-or-nothing" proposition.

People may work full time 40 to 45 years and then retire abruptly at 65 or earlier. Many older Americans, however, would like something in between working full time and not at all.

Vocational education for elderly persons can be an effective means to achieve this objective or to make possible a career switch suitable to an individual's preferences.

Vocational training or retraining is also essential for older persons who must learn new skills, especially when their present ones have been displaced by technological advances.

A 1981 Louis Harris poll for the National Council on the Aging revealed that about two out of five persons—39 percent—55 to 64 years would either be interested or very interested in learning new skills or participating in a job-training program to obtain new employment.

That same poll made it clear that employment is a major reason for older persons to enroll in training activities. About 56 percent of respondents 55 to 64 years old took educational courses to acquire marketable job skills.

These pressures may be even greater today because older Americans are being whipsawed to a degree unparalleled in modern history.

Unemployment for persons 55 or older is at near recordbreaking levels. During the past year joblessness for older Americans has increased by 46 percent, from 534,000 in August 1981 to 770,000 in August 1982.

This bleak situation really represents only the tip of the iceberg because there is a substantial amount of "hidden" unemployment among people 55 or order.

These individuals may not show up in the Department of Labor's statistical count. However, large numbers of older perons are dropping out of the labor force to take actuarially reduced social security benefits.

99-856 O—82——4

In fact, 87 percent of all persons claiming retired worker's benefits in 1978 applied before age 65. Many persons 55 or older have simply given up looking for work after a long and futile search. Others believe that they have no chance because unemployment is at its highest level since 1941.

The evidence is clear and convincing, though, that large numbers of persons 55 or older want or need to work. High unemployment has contributed to the sharp rise in poverty among older Americans.

Poverty has jumped by 1 million for persons 55 or older during the past 3 years—from 5.1 million in 1978 to 6.1 million in 1981. This represents the sharpest increase over a 3-year period since poverty statistics were first tabulated more than two decades ago.

And, poverty is likely to increase sharply again in 1982 for older Americans because of the exceptionally high level of unemployment during this year.

I turn now to vocational education which is crucial for displaced homemakers.

One of the chief target groups for the present Vocational Educational Act is displaced homemakers, who represent a growing segment in our society. Present vocational education efforts are directed toward younger displaced homemakers.

Many older homemakers are discovering that they are ill-prepared to adjust to their new roles, after the loss of their husbands through death or divorce.

These displaced homemakers are oftentimes thrust into the job market when they have little or no marketable skills, or at best their skills are greatly outdated.

Yet, they are frequently too young to retire, but employers may consider them too old to hire because of their age and obsolete work skills—despite the valuable protection of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

These problems are especially acute for minority women. For example, about 31 percent of all older black families are headed by women 55 years or older with no husband present, compared to 10 percent for white families with an older head of household.

A sound and sensible strategy to help older displaced homemakers is crucial because most married women today can expect to be widowed at some time in their life.

On the average, widows will survive their deceased husbands by 18 years. In 1979, about 80 percent of all women 45 to 54 years old were married; 4 percent were single; 8 percent were widowed; and 8 percent were divorced.

Widowhood increases sharply with advancing age—to 19 percent for those 55 to 64 years old, 41 percent for women 65 to 74, and almost 70 percent for females 75 or older.

Today more older women work than at any time in our history. Some work to supplement their husband's earnings. Others want to work because they prefer to remain active.

Large numbers must work to make ends meet, especially older women who are divorced or widowed.

During the past three decades, the labor force participation rate for women 55 to 64 years old has jumped from 27 percent in 1950 to 42 percent in 1979.

Many women in the 50's, 60's, and even more advanced ages will want or need to work during the 1980's and beyond. Vocational education can be an effective tool to give them greater options and to help them to overcome barriers to employment and reemployment.

I turn now to demographic and economic reasons.

Today's economic and demographic realities make it apparent that the trend toward earlier and full retirement may simply be too costly for our Nation, public and private pension programs, employers, and workers.

The cost of paying for retirement is becoming more burdensome because Americans are retiring earlier and living longer.

Social security's long-range financing problems are attributed, in large part, to a much higher ratio of retiree beneficiaries to workers.

Life expectancy at the upper ages has also risen sharply. When social security benefits were first paid in 1940, life expectancy for women 65 years old was 13.7 years. By 1980 it had increased by 36 percent to 18.7 years.

In the year 2000, a 65-year-old female can expect to live another 21.1 years, or 54 percent longer than a similarly situated older woman in 1940.

Life expectancy for older men has also risen, although not as dramatically as for older women. Life expectancy for men 65 years old has incraeased by 19 percent, from 12.0 years in 1940 to 14.3 years in 1980.

Social security actuaries project that a 65-year-old male will live, on the average, 15.8 more years in 2000, or 32 percent longer than in 1940.

These facts make it evident that our Nation must reverse the trend toward earlier and earlier retirement. AARP believes that there should be positive incentives for persons to work to more advanced ages—such as abolishing mandatory retirement, incresing the delayed retirement credit under social security, and phashing out the social security retirement test—rather than arbitrarily raise the social security eligibility age for full benefits to 68.

Another positive incentive is to make vocational educational opportunities more readily available for older Americans. This will not only help persons 55 or older but also our Nation.

For example, the revitalization of the American economy can benefit significantly from the input of older workers—in the same manner that it can benefit from the employment of women and minorities.

No nation can ever achieve its full potential if some of its most experienced workers, such as older Americans, are banished to the sidelines.

Much more can be achieved by a comprehensive training program to maximize job opportunities for all Americans, whether they are young or old, black, white, or another color; or men or women.

In all these cases, though, the payoff hinges on effective education for these new or former workers so that they can realize their full productive potential.

I turn now to the existing Vocational Education Act as it focuses on younger persons.

The present Vocational Education Act is heavily tilted toward younger persons. Older Americans are not mentioned per se as a priority group for services.

In fact, there are only two minor references to older persons in the law. Section 134(a)(7) provides that basic grants may be used to establish vocational resource centers to meet a long list of needs of out-of-school individuals, including entering the labor market late in life.

Section 150(b) authorizes vocational education funds to encourage outreach programs for youths and adults, including the aged, young children, handicapped persons, and others.

Federal vocational education funds are allocated to States according to a two-factor formula based on population and per capita income. This formula is heavily weighted toward younger persons.

Additionally, federally funded vocational education programs offered at community colleges, high school centers for adults and women's centers rarely address the needs of older women, even though the current Vocational Education Act recognizes that displaced homemakers especially need such services.

In conclusion, AARP strongly believes that vocational education should be for all age groups. A more positive and coherent national older worker policy needs to be developed.

Today many persons seem to regard the trend toward earlier and earlier retirement as inevitable, and perhaps even desirable. AARP challenges this notion.

We believe, instead, that our policies should provide older Americans with a wide range of options, depending upon their needs and desires.

One positive means to accomplish this goal is to build on present training and educational components of the Vocational Education Act.

The Older Americans Vocational Education Act is a soundly conceived and fiscally responsible approach to provide the framework to make this objective a reality.

For these reasons, we reaffirm our support for this legislation and urge the subcommittee to incorporate it in future legislation to extend the Vocational Education Act.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

We will go on to our next witness.

We will call now Eric Knudson, president, Wave III Associates, Wilton, Conn.

We are pleased to have you.

You may proceed.

[Prepared statement of Eric Knudson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ERIC W. KNUDSON AND JOHN A. JACOBSEN, WAVE III ASSOCIATES, WILTON, CONN.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we appreciate your invitation to appear before the Committee on Labor and Education to testify in favor of the bill H.R. 6985

The Three R's (Reading, Riting, and Rithmetic) occupy much of our formative years. Soon they will also occupy our later years; but in this case, they will stand for Retire, Retrain, and Re-enter.

The older worker population, particularly the 30,000,000 or so who are officially retired, represents a vast, untapped, constantly renewing resource of tremendous value. Think of all that experience and brain power just wasting away because no one has thought how to harness this energy.

A significant percentage (a recent Harris poll suggests in the order of two-thirds) of older persons would like some kind of part time work. They are generally no longer looking for a full time career, but rather a means to gradually wind down in a meaningful, productive, stimulating capacity.

The typical part-time jobs available to the older workers tend to be low paying, menial and degrading to professionals who had attained significant levels in their earlier careers. Grocery bagging clerks, night watchmen and the like are not the type of jobs that will induce many back to work.

At the same time, there is existing work within industry that is not getting done due to shortages of qualified workers. In addition, the new computer age is heralding a whole new

generation of occupations that never existed before (e.g. word processing specialists) that can very conveniently be done on a part time or job shared basis.

Until recently, my company ACS America, with its wholly owned subsidiary Wave III Corporation, was a computer software development company that designed and marketed computer software. Wave III trained and subsequently employed members of the retirement community to perform a substantial portion of our computer programming efforts.

In recent years, there has been a tremendous shortage of computer programmers --- some experts have estimated up to 50,000. While the current recession has tempered this situation somewhat, this shortage will remain a fact of life for many years to come.

There is not, however, a shortage in the more challenging and financially rewarding systems and technical positions to which young graduates aspire --- creating a constant movement of young programmers from one job to another. Obviously, this is both expensive and disruptive to an on-going business.

Consequently, we chose to look to the vast untapped resource of retirees to create a more stable work force. We offered free training and subsequent employment on a part-time basis as independent contractors, enabling the older worker to set their own work schedules. They could either work in our computer centers in Bradenton, Florida and Alexandria, Virginia --- or out of their own homes on computer terminals linked by telephone to

our central computer.

The program proved enormously successful. With virtually no advertising whatsoever, publicity and word-of-mouth resulted in over 6000 applications from retirees across the country. We trained over 100 and had employed 2/3 of these when we were forced to shut down operations due to cash flow problems of the parent company --- which subsequently was forced into bankruptcy.

Wave III, however, proved to all involved that this was an idea whose time has come. Consequently, I and a former ACS Vice President John Jacobsen who is here with me today, have formed a consulting group called Wave III Associates which is dedicated to promoting the concepts of training older workers for new careers within private industry.

For example, we have just recently completed a study for The Travelers Insurance Company to show them how they could train and subsequently employ the older worker within their data processing environment. They were so interested in the idea, that they are now considering starting up a separate operation which would train older workers from the entire Hartford, Connecticut area to perform computer programming and related services for themselves and any other company in the area.

Our study and proposals now rest with their management and it is too early to say whether they will proceed at this time with this project. However, we feel that a bill like H.R. 6985 is essential to provide the necessary direction and momentum

required to fully establish the concepts of retraining older workers for full or part time employment in a variety of new professions.

Probably the most important reason to use this resource is the attitude of the retirees themselves. Having worked a great portion of their lives, most of them had achieved levels of responsibility and competency before they retired, which provided considerable self-satisfaction. Now, having spent one or more years in retirement, the thrill of the freedom and the relaxed environment has begun to wear off and that old feeling of self-satisfaction is sorely missed. We are not talking about just being busy; more so a sense of achievement and the feeling of being productive.

In addition, this work force provides a definite advantage over today's force of younger professionals. There is not the perpetual pressure for career advancement or to work only with the latest technology because it "looks good on a resume". The retirement work force is steady, reliable and cohesive.

The most significant thing that the government can do, however, is to stop looking at the entire retirement population as a group of people to be "taken care of". Certainly, there is a definite segment in this population that cannot fend for themselves without help. These are the sick, the poor, the feeble. These people need and deserve government assistance.

But, there is a large mass, counted in the millions and growing

every day, in the retirement community that are healthy, vibrant, and capable of being highly productive. The prevailing attitude that "the poor elderly must be protected, babied, and kept occupied" not only doesn't apply to this latter group, it is offensive. And, it is definitely standing in the way of any serious program to put them back to work. This attitude has not been just the preserve of the legislators, but has been rampant among the staff members, bureaucrats, and functionaries in such Federal departments as Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. H.R. 6985 is one of the first true efforts to break with this unfortunate trend.

The participants in the Wave III program came from widely varied backgrounds, educational levels, vocational skills and financial situations. We had a retired Army General, former Vice Presidents from Chase Manhattan Bank, IBM, and a major oil company. We also had two PhD's in mathematics, a superintendent of schools, a registered nurse, a housewife who had never worked outside her home a day in her life, a Criminal Investigator for the IRS, and assorted Engineers, Managers, Accountants and Clerical Supervisors.

Since the computer age is so new, few older workers have any prior data processing experience. An interesting finding, however, was that prior data processing knowledge did not give a participant any better chance of success in computer programming than those who had no such knowledge; a strong indication that there is no good substitute for current training when dealing with current technology.

Although the problems of the older worker are the immediate concern, they are only the tip of the iceberg of the true dislocation of the normal career progression this country's workforce will experience over the next few decades. With the rapid advances in technology, communications, product life cycle, and the periodic dramatic swings of the economy and government spending, certain job classifications and some times whole industries can become redundant in a relatively short period of time.

The problems currently faced by the 55+ year old worker are expanding to the 45 or 50 year old worker as well. It is now a reasonable projection that by the end of this century the average worker must expect to retrain for a different career after age 35 to 40, and possible at intervals thereafter.

There are the dramatic examples of the unemployed aerospace engineers in the last decade, or the New York stock brokers and investment analysts driving taxi's to earn a living --- or, the recent excess of public school teachers while at the same time there is a projected shortage of these same teachers just five years hence.

The most consistent and obvious need for retraining is with the older or retired worker, but unless this nation establishes an aggressive program of vocational retraining, we are asking for serious and persistent economic dislocations and productivity losses over the next ten to twenty years. The government must

work in concert with the private sector to build meaningful vocational retraining networks --- that are responsive to economic and industrial needs and cycles. It will be expensive if done right, but in the long run, it will be considerably more expensive if we do it poorly, or not at all.

A very significant element in the multiple career concept, particularly with regard to retirees, is the impact it would have on "dying" professions and on jobs that have a predictable obsolesence. In assuming a single career in a lifetime, there are many fields or vocations that are shunned by the younger population as "having no future". Why train for a postion for which it is obvious that there will be little need in ten years or less?

This anticipation has the effect of creating premature shortages and actually accelerating the demise of the particular job or profession. Everyone has had the experience of trying to get a six or seven year old piece of equipment serviced or repaired. Whenever a new service, a new model machine, a new computer software system, etc. is introduced, the people working with or maintaining the old version want to immediately move to the new one --- because that is where the future is. Many of these problems would be eliminated if there was a multiple career focus.

When moving from one service to another, or one model of a machine to another, the transition does not occur overnight. The old service or equipment is generally kept in use by a large

population for several years after its replacement is introduced. This population must still be serviced for that period. This can become quite costly for the provider of these services as the employee force trained in these services dwindles. (With some companies, of course, the lack of on-going service is a marketing ploy to encourage the customer to purchase the new product.)

The second career or, with the older worker, the ending career concept would permit the effective trining for these services, even though the anticipated job life were only five to ten years. One of the best examples of this would be in the maintenance of computer software systems after their development was complete and they were in full production.

If, as President Reagan has proclaimed, it is the private sector which will eventually solve our country's economic problems (including unemployment), then there should be some mechanism established so that the appropriate agencies can work with and assist the private sector to get the process started.

There is one particular element of this piece of legislation that makes it stand out from all the rest and, in my opinion, would give the ensuing program the greatest chance for true success. That element is the inclusion of private industry in the program.

To be effective, vocational and technical training must remain much closer and responsive to the jobs and industries toward which it is directed than traditionally has been the case with most of this nation's institutions of higher learning. This can

only be achieved through a close association with private industry for whom these people are to be trained.

However, the government is loathe to give such funds to profit-making companies, preferring instead to deal with universities, foundations and other non-profit organizations. One thing we have never understood is that there are literally hundreds of grant programs, but virtually no loan programs. We don't know whether the concept of someone actually paying the government back for something is so foreign to those in Washington that it is simply beyond consideration, or that a repayable loan would not give the specific governmental agency sufficient control of the content of a particular project to insure that it came out the way they wanted. You must admit that it would be a rare experience for the government to be receiving interest rather than paying it (with the exception of the Small Business Administration loan program).

While well received in concept, the ogre of profit reared its ugly head and Wave III Corporation was turned down for any grant programs (even when submitted in conjuction with the American Association of Retired Persons, a well-established non-profit organization). It was overheard that Wave III was cited for "making excessive profits by exploiting the elderly." Profit? Eventually Wave III would have been profitable, but we needed funding simply to stay in business (and expand at the rate that everyone wanted us to).

It is interesting to speculate that it would now be more likely

that we could receive a government research grant to study why the first company exclusively dedicated to the employment and technical retraining of older workers failed. I will state uncategorically that if H.R. 6985 were in effect 10 months ago, the original Wave III and its 100 retiree computer programmers would still be here today, demonstrating to the world the true benefits of productively retraining and employing this population segment.

In summary and based upon our direct experiences in retraining and employing older workers, we believe that this bill is required as a catalyst to help make private industry fully aware of the profit potential and productivity benefits inherent in this vast, untapped and underutilized natural resource --- the older worker.

STATEMENT OF ERIC W. KNUDSON, PRESIDENT, WAVE III ASSOCIATES

Mr. KNUDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today.

I have submitted a written statement and I will keep this brief.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, your statement will be placed in the record in its entirety.

Mr. KNUDSON. The witnesses preceding me primarily have worked for a considerable time in programs for the elderly and in the network. But we have not.

The reason we are here today is simply that we have taken a number of retirees and have retrained them vocationally in a high technology industry and have put them back to work. They are working successfully at it.

Ours was a company that developed computer software both in the public and private sector. We are known as Wave III.

What we did was that we brought retirees in two locations. One is in Sarasota, Fla., and the other is in Alexandria, Va.

We trained these people for a period of a little over 3 months as to how to be computer programers. We then offered them contractual work in the programing field.

This has worked out quite successfully. The original company in working with this did strike into hard times. But the training that we provided and the people out of the program, particularly right now in Florida, 30 of our former trainees have banded together, formed their own company, and strictly with the knowledge that we imparted to them, they are now successfully running their own company down in Florida as a computer software firm.

Our experience with the older worker and with retraining them has been that they are good workers. They are dedicated. They really want to work.

We were amazed. We used an aptitude test which is one of the best in the industry.

On this aptitude test on a nationwide basis you have an average of 18 percent to 22 percent who were recommended by the testing agency for programing.

The record of the people we tested—the senior citizens and the retirees—we had nearly a 40-percent rate of recommendation that they become computer programers.

We experienced one phenomenon that the general populus thinks that you have problems of help with the older workers. We had over 100 people over the period of time, 15 months.

They were coming to the office every single day, spending the whole day there most of the time.

In that population of 100 there were only 3 that ever showed up with any kind of health problem that made it difficult to perform the work.

I think that very closely correlates to the whole work population.

One of the key points I would like to stress is this. I am delighted to be here today because the majority of jobs in this country are in the private industry.

When you are talking about this location of the economy of the work force of the advance in technology and job changes, they happen very, very rapidly.

It is only through vocational and technical training that we can be responsive in the economy to do it.

The 4-year colleges are not that responsive to the technical changes. A good solid program of 3 to 6 months training and put them right back to work in the required area will be of tremendous assistance to the economy.

Only demonstrations of this ability throughout multiple disciples would seriously bring industry itself to performing this on its own.

We were successful at it in just one field. There is a tremendous shortage of computer programers.

But there are many, many areas that are growing very, very rapidly. There is something called CADCAM. It is Computer Aided Design in Computer Aided Manufacturing.

This results in a lot more technical skill being able to run it. We are replacing some of the engineers with technicians. The health field with lab technicans and particularly the mass of clerical jobs which over the next 10 years are going to be rapidly upgraded into word processing specialists and all kinds of different things, are going to require additional training and technical training.

And retirees or people over the age of 55 can do this and want to do it.

The final thing I want to say on this is this. The response we had was tremendous.

We never paid any money for advertising at all to attract the retirees. We had just a couple of articles in the local paper. Some of the national press picked it up.

We had well over 6,000 applications for our first 2 classes alone. We today, even though we are not operating this program directly

today, are receiving dozens of applications a week from all over the country.

These people want to work and they want to be retrained and do something significant and challenging. I think this bill, particularly with its association with the educational institutions and with private industry, profitmaking industry, will result in their using the output.

They are the ones who would have a serious interest and would make certain that the training was current. I commend Congressman Ratchford in sponsoring this bill.

Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you.

Mr. Ratchford?

Mr. RATCHFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank the panel for coming on short notice. I also want to commend them for giving concise statements knowing that we have time restraints this morning.

As Commissioner on Aging, I observed in Connecticut that there was a great need in this particular area. Several communities in my State—west Hartford in particular, and also in Mr. Knudson's area—there was a senior job bank.

Norwalk had a senior job bank where there was an attempt to match up older workers and their skills with opportunities existing on the jobsite.

Is it your sense that the older worker, then, as I read your combined testimonies, will participate willingly in this type of program and, in fact, give evidence that the old maxim that you cannot teach an old dog new tricks is a wrong maxim and needs to be reexamined?

Is this a vehicle for doing that? How do you feel about that in the private sector, that is, about training an older worker for new skills, for example?

Mr. KNUDSON. We seem to have attracted a very large number of old dogs who do learn new tricks. They really like to do it. They are interested.

The job bank thing that you were talking about, in my opinion, has not had the success that it should have had, but people look at the careers that individuals have had in the past. They have gone far beyond.

A lot of their knowledge is 10 or 15 years old.

The jobs today, because of the change without retraining, are either at a fairly low level where the companies are afraid of the age or other programs.

That retraining makes them into excellent workers.

Mr. RATCHFORD. Does AARP have any sense as to how many older workers are out there who would need this kind of redirection, retraining and retooling, if you will, to compete in today's economy?

Mr. HACKING. We do not have any accurate statistics on that. I would cite the Lou Harris survey that I mentioned.

That survey indicated that there has been over the last 6 or 7 years a substantial increase in the proportion of persons between the ages of 55 and 64 who are looking to educational opportunities

as a means of acquiring skills that will improve their prospects in the job market.

I would also add that the AARP's Institute of Lifetime Learning has published a brochure entitled, Second Career Opportunities for Older Persons.

This brochure has gone through three printings now since January of this year. We have printed and disposed of some 25,000 copies.

That gives us the idea there is a great deal of interest in this sort of thing.

Mr. RATCHFORD. In many parts of the country we see a shift of industry from one area to another. For example, in our part of the country, copper, brass, and steel industries are not operating at the capacity that they used to because of economic reasons, and the impact of imports.

Would you find that an area experiencing such a shift would have a greater need for this type of vocational training and opportunity?

Mr. HACKING. Yes, I would think so.

We have long known about the phenomenon of skill obsolescence, but there is also, we think, a similar kind of need to provide people with skills to enter growth industry or just to develop second careers completely different from what they knew in their early employment years.

Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Knudson, would you highlight your testimony as to the "reliability of the older worker"?

I notice that some employers still feel they need to go younger as opposed to going older, so to speak.

Do you have any sense of the track record of the older worker or the reliability of a retrained older worker in today's highly skilled and highly competitive job market?

Mr. KNUDSON. Our experience in that area is, that is, from the data processing point of view, is this.

I have been in it for 15 years. They actually make better workers than we have today.

They bring a sense of maturity. They have that work ethic, or whatever you want to call it. Computer programing, particularly, is a judgmental type of function.

You can build several different ways and still achieve the end result.

There is greater care taken in the checking of the work they have done and staying longer to make certain it was done correctly. They have adjusted their hours so that they can make maximum use of the machines.

They really have made an all-out effort to do this. A very significant element within that age group exists. They are trying to do a job and they are not working for a resume. They are not beating each other over the head competing for the greater promotion or whatever. They are just good solid workers.

We were extremely pleased, as I have said, particularly with their attitude.

Mr. RATCHFORD. I share your point of view.

I yield back my time. But let me say this.

My interest in this issue stems not only from my experience as the Commissioner of Aging in Connecticut, but also through a family experience. My father, at age 48, lived in Danbury, Conn., and worked in a declining industry, hat manufacturing. This industry eventually left our area, and my father was told for the better part of a year that he was too old to work. We had to face that every day.

The industry at its peak had 5,500 employees and now it has 200.

Then he was told that they were not sure that he could develop the skills necessary for another industry. He eventually went to work in a machine shop.

It seems to me that if we say to the older worker that they are too old, or they cannot learn new skills, that we are producing the greatest waste in America. That is a waste of human talent.

I applaud AARP and I certainly applaud Wave III for their belief that through legislation we can provide a vehicle for opportunity for a great pool of talent in America, and that is the older worker.

If we need any evidence of the talent of the older American, we had it today with Senator Claude Pepper. He certainly should not be told that he is too old at age 82 to continue to work on behalf of the elderly, and to contribute to the redefining of America's views on older workers.

So collectively, I thank you.

I yield back my time.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you a couple of questions.

I want to ask you if you are aware of institutions which have special training programs for the elderly. If so, how are they working out?

Mr. HACKING. Let me ask my colleague, Ms. Klippensteen, to respond to that.

Ms. KLIPPENSTEEN. There are only a limited number of programs throughout the United States which focus attention on the older worker per se.

Some successful programs have trained older people in health care services and home aid services.

This displaced homemaker program has been successful in retraining some older women with limited workplace experience in community service jobs or in jobs such as nurses aides or food service.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Knudson?

Mr. KNUDSON. I have had little experience in the professional vocational training within the private sector.

The Travelers Insurance Co. did come to us and said that they liked the whole concept of Wave III. They have over 2,000 people in their data processing department.

We have just completed a study for them to see whether they can implement a program within Travelers itself. It is in management's hands now. They will decide.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you a question and then Mr. Goodling will pose some questions.

Let us take the older American today and let us assume that this bill passes and he is trained or retrained.

The difficulty, however, is to get older people hired by industry today.

How do you think that we can cope with that problem? What should we do to address that problem in legislation?

I want to hear your views on that.

Down my way, if you have someone who has been retrained from sawmilling, the coal industry will not hire him. How are we going to get that man hired somewhere?

Mr. HACKING. Mr. Chairman, you have raised an excellent point. We know that there is a substantial amount of discrimination with regard to older workers.

However, there is also indication that attitude has begun to change. The Lou Harris polling organization found a significant change in attitude among personnel department managers in corporations.

They did that study for the National Council on Aging recently.

Nevertheless, the point you raise is quite correct and well taken. We think the vehicle through which it ought to be addressed is the Age Discrimination and Employment Act.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Knudson?

Mr. KNUDSON. This piece of legislation will go quite a ways toward that. I am not certain that it is legislation as such which will ultimately do it.

I think demonstration programs with industry involvement where the training is performed and then they get to see the output is the way to go.

What we did, fortunately for us and unfortunately because it was just a demonstration, was this. We trained and we employed them ourselves because we needed the workers.

To do that and to do a demonstration like that in several disciplines is one way.

There has always been a question as to whether the older people can do the technical jobs. But that demonstration probably will be the biggest single cause of industry finally opening up the doors and rehiring the older worker.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me merely reiterate what the chairman said. When we legislate we cannot change hearts and minds. I have that concern also in relationship to this. We do not want to raise false expectations for a retraining program if we then discover that we cannot do much about moving labor and management in the direction of hiring that senior citizen.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me thank the entire panel of witnesses. This has been very helpful to us this morning.

The subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional material follows:]

September 30, 1982

The Honorable Carl D. Perkins
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Perkins:

The American Association of Retired Persons strongly urges you to incorporate H.R. 6985 (Older Americans Vocational Education Act) in future legislation to extend the Vocational Education Act. The Association has worked closely with Representative Ratchford in developing H.R. 6985. We believe that it is a soundly conceived bill which is realistic in terms of budgetary and political realities.

H.R. 6985 would establish a three-year, $20 million annual demonstration program to promote employment opportunities for persons 55 or older by:

--Training or retraining to update work skills;

--Assisting persons to make later-life career changes, with special emphasis on the needs of the older displaced homemakers;

--Providing information, counseling and support services to assist older persons in obtaining employment; and

--Encouraging community colleges, technical schools, and others to offer more job training opportunities directed at older Americans.

AARP believes strongly that vocational education should be available for all age groups. However, the present law is heavily tilted towards younger persons. Older Americans are not mentioned per se as a priority group for services. In fact, there are only two minor references to older persons in the law.

Education and employment opportunities are clearly high priorities for aged and aging Americans. This point has been made emphatically to the AARP Institute of Lifetime Learning through scientific surveys, conversations with older persons and letters from our members. For example, the Institute of Lifetime Learning has published a brochure on

Arthur F. Bouton
President, AARP

Cyril F. Brickfield
Executive Director

National Headquarters: 1909 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20049 (202) 872-4700

"Second Career Opportunities for Older Persons." We have already had three printings since January 1982 because of the great demand. We have printed more than 25,000 copies of this document and expect to print additional editions.

The need for vocational education for older Americans is especially acute today because many persons 55 and older are being whipsawed by the recession. Unemployment for older Americans is at near record-breaking levels. During the past year, joblessness for people 55 and older has increased by 46 percent, from 534,000 in August 1981 to 770,000 in August 1982. Many experts are forecasting even higher levels in the months ahead. This will force more older persons to take permanently reduced Social Security benefits before age 65.

Vocational education is also essential for older displaced homemakers who have been largely overlooked by current programs. Many are discovering that they are ill-prepared to adjust to their new roles, after the loss of their husbands through death or divorce. These displaced homemakers are oftentimes thrust into the job market when they have little or no marketable skills, or at best their skills are greatly outdated. Yet, they are frequently too young to retire, but employers may consider them too old to hire because of their age and obsolete work skills.

For these reasons, we reaffirm our support for H.R. 6985. We believe that this legislation provides a means to maximize job opportunities for all Americans, whether they are young or old. Older Americans attending vocational education classes can increase their earning power, permitting them to purchase more goods and services in our economy. This, in turn, will create more job opportunities for younger persons and others. In short, we believe that increased vocational educational opportunities produces a "win-win" situation for older and younger persons alike.

Sincerely,

Peter W Hughes

Peter W. Hughes
Legislative Counsel

PWH/DAA

Prepared Statement of Edward A. Sillari, Danbury, Conn.

(Endorsed by the Connecticut Advisory Council on Vocational and Career Education, Hartford, Conn.)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Edward A. Sillari of Danbury, Connecticut. I retired from the Danbury Public Schools superintendency in 1974 after eleven years in the position. After one year of retirement I joined the Connecticut State Department of Education as Associate Commissioner for Vocational Education and State Director of its seventeen Regional-Vocational Technical Schools. I retired from this position in 1977. Since then I have served as a consultant in vocational education for the State Department of Education, for regional educational councils and individual school systems. Currently, I am serving as a consultant to the Capital Region Education Council (CREC), West Hartford, Connecticut, as it works with a group of ten towns, including schools, business, industry and labor, in a cooperative-collabarative effort to expand vocational education opportunities in the Farmington Valley (Connecticut) region for all citizens of employable age.

My formal involvement with vocational education began in 1937. During a span of forty-five years I have shared in the development and operation of a broad variety of vocational programs for youth and adults in two states at both local and state levels. As president of the New Hampshire State Teachers Association, president of the Connecticut Association of School Administrators and chairman of the Committee on Federal Legislation for the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), I have been close to the evolvement of state and federal legislation which, over a span of years, has so dramatically moved vocational education forward in its capacity to serve the vocational aspirations for people and the productive needs of the nation.

It is out of this context of training and experience that I speak to the issue of establishing model centers for vocational education programs for older persons as put forward in H.R. 6985, the Older Americans Vocational Education Act.

There are now more than 46 million persons in the United States who are fifty-five years of age or older. These numbers are increasing rapidly due to decreasing birth rates and increasing life expectancies. As we look toward the future we are told by medical researchers that life expectancy will rise to eight-five years. This means an increased potential productive life for the individual and an extension of productivity for the older worker as part of the total work force.

Financial security will always be a prime concern for older persons -- a concern which will be extended by an increasing life expectancy. During periods of inflation, when the purchasing power of the dollar is steadily going down and fixed incomes provide little, if any, means for adjustment, the concern can become critical and the necessity for continued employment, or a return to employment, can become a vital and pressing problem.

In a period of economic recession such as we are now experiencing, we note a sharp decline in employment. In August of this year, it was reported that 9.8% of the work force, or nearly 11 million persons, were out of work. As we anticipate economic recovery, we know from previous experience with the cycles of recession and recovery--that the older worker is at a disadvantage. He will find it more difficult to get back into the mainstream of employment. Many of the jobs he is qualified for will have been eliminated or taken over by some form of automation. New areas of employment growth more often represent new fields for which the older worker is not trained or prepared. This is particularly true of high technology, service and informational areas. The jobs of the future are less and less in the old-line, traditional, manufacturing industries such as steel, automobiles, rubber and textiles, but will be found more and more in high technology, computers, accounting, banking, engineering, health care and related fields.

A study by Professor Barry Bluestone of Boston College points out how New England, in the period from 1957 to 1975, lost 80% of its manufacturing jobs. As a result, the major portion of those who lost their jobs were unable to find employment and dropped out of the labor force. The older worker, with obsolescent skills and little mobility for movement to areas where such skills may be marketable, is desparately in need of an opportunity to acquire retraining so that newly acquired skills will once more provide an opportunity for employment. Only a focus of attention on the plight of the older unemployed worker without employable skills can reduce the problem and provide the older worker a continuing productive career.

The Vocational Education Act, as amended (P.L. 94-482) authorizes, among other things, Federal Grants in vocational education --

"to assist States in improving planning in the use of all resources available to them for vocational education and manpower training . . .

to develop new programs of vocational education . . .

so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State . . . will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and abilities to benefit from such training."

It is clear from the text of the law that older persons are included within the parameters of the Act. However, the older person has no specific focus in the Act as do certain other special categories such as - handicapped - disadvantaged - those without ability to speak English. In a very real sense the older person who is unemployed is, in a broader context, both handicapped and disadvantaged. In addition they may have a physical or mental handicap which provides other problems to overcome. They face a variety of stumbling blocks in their efforts to become employed. Of particular relevancy for the older worker are --

1. the elimination of jobs in traditional manufacturing fields
2. replacement of workers with robots or other forms of automation
3. a trend toward more production abroad and a reduction of jobs at home
4. a shift in the economy from manufacturing toward service oriented jobs
5. decreasing mobility
6. obsolescence of existing skills
7. non-existence of opportunity for retraining and the acquisition of new skills realistically related to employment opportunities in the area of residence.

H.R. 6985, "a bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to make grants available for vocational programs for older persons and to establish... model centers for vocational education for older persons", provides emphasis on older persons as a special group within the total employable population. Identification of the needs of older persons for training or retraining as a national priority program provides the focus of attention which the problem needs. This legislation would tend to offset the current lack of attention which is to be found in the State plans which are annually developed and implemented under the requirements of the Act.

In Connecticut, as in all other States, vocational education is a significant component of the total educational structure. Its ability to provide trained and productive workers for entry level jobs, to train and

retrain adults in need of upgraded or new skills, to establish training programs for specific purposes in times of need or crisis and to achieve these ends effectively within the scope of State and Federal law is a well established and accepted fact. It follows, therefore, that the vocational education establishment is particularly well fitted to assume a task which, in truth, represents an amplification and a new focus on a particular problem which, in general terms, is already within the scope of existing Federal Legislation -- namely P.L. 94-482.

In Connecticut, for example, there exists an extensive network of public and private institutions and agencies which provide vocational education programs for students of all ages and at all levels during day and evening hours. Vocational education programs for adults are a significant part of the local adult education programs, the offerings of the State regional vocational-technical schools, the State community colleges, the State technical colleges and the State colleges.

Planning and implementing new programs which focus specifically on the needs of older persons, as outlined in H.B. 6985, should not be difficult to achieve. All of the components for successful "pilot centers" are available --

1. the older person--
2. the expertise of professionals in vocational education--
3. the human and technical resources of business, industry and labor --
4. the coordinating influence of State Departments of Education coupled with assistance from State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education--
5. the nation's need for effective workers who have the skills needed for employment in an ever changing economy.

H.B. 6985 can provide the ingredients for success which are needed to complete the process --

1) a focus of attention on older workers and their particular needs

2) creation of "pilot centers" which must become "beacon lights of achievement"

3) funds to support the concept and the "pilot centers"

However, I truly believe, that certain safeguards must be established in order to guarantee that grants provided by H.B. 6985 are, in fact, used only for the purposes set forth in the law.

I would propose that any "eligible recipient" submitting a proposal would be required to provide evidence, as specified by the Secretary of Education that —

1. The planning process has included representatives of business, industry, labor and older persons in the identification of vocational programs to be initiated in the "Pilot Center".

2. There is in existence, within the areas served by the program, real job opportunities for persons completing each of the vocational programs operated by the "Model Center" and that the existence of these job opportunities be attested to by employers in the region.

3. Support services, as established under the requirements of the law, be required to maintain follow-up records for each person who successfully completes a vocational program operated by the "Model Center" and that such record be made part of the reporting process and required as part of any subsequent proposal for continuation of the "Model Center".

INSTITUTE OF LIFETIME LEARNING
A Service of the American Association of Retired Persons
1909 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20049 (202) 728-4666

October 25, 1982

Mr. Carl D. Perkins, Chairman
House of Representatives
Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and
Vocational Education
Rayburn House Office Building B-346C
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Perkins:

I was called upon to testify at the hearing on Bill HR 6985 on September 23, 1982. At the hearing I was asked about institutions which have special training programs for the elderly. I would like to include the following exemplary programs for the record.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Annette Klippensteen

Annette Klippensteen
Education Specialist

College Counseling and Retraining

Project Hire for Employment is sponsored by Middlesex Community College in Bedford, Massachusetts and is funded by a grant from the Area Agency on Aging and contributions from private industry. Senior aides are hired to do peer counseling; informal workshops are held to develop job finding skills; classes are recommended for those who need retraining to update skills or training for new careers; and a Skills Bank which lists older persons and the services they can perform is used for job placement reference. Project Hire has assisted over 1,000 older people in retraining and developing job finding skills to find employment over the past four years.

Private Sector/College and Non-Profit Organization Team

The Displaced Homemaker center in Orlando, Florida has joined forces with the Valencia Community College Council for Continuing Education for Women and the Junior League to assist displaced homemakers (many of whom are older people). Newcomers to the Orlando center receive a two week cram course in returning to the job market which includes counseling, resume writing, communications techniques and mock interview conducted in the community with cooperating businesses. Graduates of the course join a "job club" that meets weekly to assess progress on personal goals.

The Junior League has initiated a Job Internship Program which enlists the aid of private businesses and industry to place older women in six-month apprenticeships designed to lead to permanent positions. The program is funded by a Junior League grant for three years ($51,000) and the program is staffed with volunteers who scout

job opportunities and try to match displaced homemakers skills with business openings.

College/Private and Public Sector

The Senior Adult Program at Los Angeles Valley College is based on a work-study concept whereby older students are trained for placement in part-time or full-time employment opportunities in the community. During the first year the program received 289 applications and placed 101 persons. During the second year it placed 135 persons. Employers report generally high satisfaction with senior student performances. Currently more than 1,000 students over 60 years old are enrolled in the Senior Adult Program. Volunteers are used for career counseling and job development dimensions of this program. Many of the volunteers come from the ranks of senior students.

Private Non-Profit/University

The major goal of Project CARING is to fill a need for qualified day-care workers in the Chicago area by training older workers in the theory and practice of child care. The project's further objectives are 1) to provide older workers with a marketable skill and to give them the sense of self-worth that comes with the flexibility to learn new skills, and 2) to meet their need for income, rather than focusing on their needs for physical and social services like meals-on-wheels and recreation centers.

Project CARING is the product of the combined expertise of three organizations, each working in a different field: 1) the YMCA, which runs 12 day-care centers in Chicago, 2) Operation ABLE (Ability Based on Long Experience), a privately funded, non-profit employment organization, which coordinates the efforts of 35 employment services for older workers in the Chicago area; and 3) the Erikson Institute of

Advanced Studies for Child Development, a graduate institute associated with Loyola University.

The training takes place in four YMCA day-care centers in the city of Chicago. Project CARING gives older workers 10 months of training in the theory of child care and provides them with hands-on experience in the practical application of the skills they learn in the classroom.

Government Agencies/Private Sector

Manufactures Hanover Trust Company is participating in a program with New York's Department for the Aging to train older people for part-time bank teller positions.

The Aging Department's Employment Unit is recruiting and testing job applicants, 55 years of age and older, with the active cooperation of the Federation Employment and Guidance Service and the city's Department of Employment. Older persons who pass the interview and orientation sessions, are referred to the bank, which selects the candidates to be enrolled in a paid, three-week training class to prepare them for entry-level positions. People who pass the bank's training course will be hired at the regular starting salary.